

SOME NOTES ON PYRAMIDELLID NOMENCLATURE.

BY TOM IREDALE.

The study of Pyramidellid Mollusks is attended with great difficulty, and systematic treatment of the family has not been attempted within recent years until the investigation of American forms was undertaken by Messrs. Dall and Bartsch. Great praise is due to their efforts which have been crowned by the publication of a Synopsis of the Genera, Subgenera and Sections of the family Pyramidellidæ. This is included in their Monograph of West American Pyramidellid Mollusks (Bull. U. S. Nat. Mus., No. 68, 1909) and inasmuch as the preface includes the remark "In all cases the synonymy of group names adopted has been based on researches which began with the typical species of the original authors," one would expect exact quotations. It is deeply to be regretted that in the preparation of the Synopsis due care was not given to the verification of the introduction of the divisional names chosen. As a consequence errors have been perpetuated and workers in remote localities will now further add confusion. To such, on account of lack of literature, are denied the means of verification, and the data provided by Messrs. Dall and Bartsch will be copied without criticism. The practical value of the work done by Messrs. Dall and Bartsch is immense, and there can be no doubt that their conclusions will in the main be unquestionably accepted. It is much against my will that I should have to point out blemishes regarding their quotations of literature. However it is only by means of criticism that we can hope to attain completeness, and I herewith indicate a few errors in the hope that when the East American Pyramidellid mollusks are monographed a revised and corrected Synopsis will be included. All the references to Dall and Bartsch in the succeeding notes are to the paper above mentioned.

ACTÆOPYRAMIS Fischer.

On p. 17—*Monotygma* Gray. Syn. Brit. Mus., 1840. I note this only to point out that in the Synopsis of the British Museum, 1840 and 1842, lists of nude generic names are given by Gray, and though often quoted these have no scientific value as of that place. No indication whatever appears as to species.

EULIMELLA.

Dall and Bartsch, on p. 10, write

Subgenus *Eulimella* Forbes, 1846 (6).

Type, *Eulimella crassula* Forbes = *E. scillæ* Scacchi.

On p. 17 is found the familiar quotation

(6) *Eulimella* Forbes, Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., Vol. 14, 1846, p. 412. This reference appears to have been introduced into literature by Hermannsen; copied by Scudder it has attained a wide acceptance, two recent users I have noted being Locard (Cat. Moll. Viv. France, 1886, p. 211) and Kobelt (Icon. Schale. Europ. Meeres conchy. Vol. III, p. 161, 1903). Yet two errors appear in it: Vol. 14 was issued in 1844 and there the genus is not introduced; a shell, *Eulima Mac Andrei* is described on p. 412 by Forbes.

The first introduction of *Eulimella* is, as given by Marschall, in the Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., Vol. XIX, p. 311, 1847, where Jeffreys writes "*Eulimella* (Forbes) *crassula* Mal. and Conch. J. *E. Mac Andrei* Forbes."

The incomplete quotation should read "Mal. and Conch. Mag. pl. I, p. 34, 1838," where Jeffreys listed *Eulima crassula* n. sp. No description was offered and its assignment to Forbes by Dall and Bartsch is incorrect.

In the P. Z. S., 1847, p. 160, Gray wrote

"*Eulimella* Forbes, 1846. . . . *Melania scillæ*. This notice appears to conform with the scant regulation now considered sufficient to carry a generic name so that it would appear that we must quote this genus as of Gray. It may be argued that Jeffreys has precedence and it seems doubtful to me to whom should be given the credit. I prefer Gray's quotation. I have searched throughout Forbes' papers from 1844 to 1847 and have been unable to meet with the name. I conclude it was a MS. name, and in support of this view would cite the Hist. Brit. Moll., p. 308, 1850. There the genus is assigned to Forbes; it is well described, and though full references are appended no notice of the previous occurrence in literature of *Eulimella* is given save the one by Jeffreys. Dall and Bartsch give as a synonym of *Eulimella*, *Loxoptyxis* Cossmann; the paper they quote was included in the Ann. Soc. Roy. Malac. Belg., Vol. XXIII, for the year 1888, p. 99. What year the Annales appeared in I cannot say, but I noticed that on the title page of those for 1896 is printed "Distribué le 24 décembre 1899."

As synonymous also is regarded *Belonidium* Cossmann, Jour. de Conch., Vol. 40, 1892, p. 350. This name appears to have been

overlooked by the compilers of the Zool. Record; it is as well to note that the part of the Jour. de Conch. containing this name was not received at the British Museum until the 10th of May, 1893, as noted in the Jour. Malac., Vol. 3, p. 9, 1894. As type of this genus Dall and Bartsch write "*Aciculina gracilis* Cossmann." Should it not be "*Aciculina gracilis* Deshayes"?

OSCILLA.

On p. 17 Dall and Bartsch include this in the synonymy of *Cingulina*; their reference reads "*Oscilla* A. Adams, Idem, 1860, p. 418; type, *Oscilla lirata* A. Adams;" the Idem stands for Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., 3d Ser., Vol. 6. But at that place *Oscilla* does not occur.

Oscilla is defined in the Proc. Zool. Soc., 1867, p. 310, where five species are included; the first species is *lirata* A. Adams, but the third is *cingulata* A. Ad., which when it was introduced as *Monoptygma cingulata* in the Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. Ser., III, Vol. VII, p. 296, 1861, was followed by this note. "This species is by no means typical, and should form a subgenus under the name of *Oscilla*." Consequently *cingulata* A. Ad. must be regarded as the type of *Oscilla*, and the name date from this introduction. There is a group of Pyramidellid mollusks which agree with *cingulata* and the subgeneric definition "*plica parietali, valida, transversa, mediana*," and though superficially resembling *Cingulina* are shorter, broader shells, and are recognizable as *Odostomias* rather than *Turbonillas*. As I can see no group to which they are otherwise referable, I advise the retention of *Oscilla* for these forms: they compose a group quite as natural as any other Pyramidellid group.

Since this note was written I have seen a paper by Hedley (P. L. S. N. S. W., Vol. XXXIV, 1909), wherein are described *Odostomia gumia*, p. 446, pl. XLI, fig. 67, *Odostomia nigra*, p. 447, pl. XLI, fig. 70, and *Odostomia laquearia*, p. 447, pl. XLIII, fig. 82. These beautiful figures indicate shells, which from their form I should class as *Oscilla*. They do not look like *Turbonilla*.

AGATHA.

Dall and Bartsch at the foot of p. 10 write "The status of *Agatha virgo* A. Adams, 1860 (*Menestho*, 1861, *Myonia*, 1861, *Amathis*, 1861), is not known to us. From the meager description we are inclined to believe that it is allied to *Actaeopyramis* Fischer."

But in the Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., Vol. 30, 1906, p. 335, pl.

XVIII, fig. 2, the same authors had redescribed and figured this shell accepting *Agatha* as a valid subgenus of *Pyramidella*. They gave full references and concluded with "*P. (A.) virgo* A. Ad. is the type of *Agatha*; we do not know why Adams changed this to *Myonia* and *Amathis* as we have been unable to find the name pre-occupied."

The references they give provide the solution of their puzzle. When A. Adams described *Agatha virgo*¹ he did not introduce a new genus, as after the description he wrote "may well be regarded as the queen of a genus of which all the species are lovely." This indicates that a genus with a number of species known to him and already described was in his mind. This is confirmed later by the remark "*Myonia virgo* is a third species of *Menes'ho*."² These two papers were written from Japan, and immediately upon receipt of the first one he corrected the error thus, "generic name should have been *Myonia* not *Agatha*."³

He then introduced *Amathis*⁴ and designated as type *Myonia virgo* A. Ad. From the preceding it seems that *Amathis* should be utilized, but a puzzling complication is introduced by the fact that later Adams himself forgot his work and reintroducing *Agatha* remarks "of which *A. virgo* A. Ad. is the type."⁵

DE FOLIN'S NAMES.

De Folin introduced many genera of his family *Chemnitzidæ* and these names are noted in Dall and Bartsch's work. The history of these names as well as the interpretation appears very imperfectly known, and it would have been well had Dall and Bartsch gone carefully into the literature. They appear to have handled the conchological work splendidly, and it is disappointing to have to find fault with their quotations. In a series entitled "Les Fonds de la Mer," which was issued in parts from 1867 onwards and is apparently complete in three volumes, De Folin described a number of *Pyramidellids*. New generic names were introduced without indication of their novelty.

At the same time De Folin drew up a classification of the *Chemnitzidæ* which was published in the Ann. Soc. Linn. Maine et Loire, Vol. XII, pp. 191 *et seq.*, 1870. This appears to have escaped Dall

¹ Annals, Ser. III, Vol. VI, 1860, p. 422. ² *Loc. cit.*, Vol. VII, 1861, p. 295.

³ *Loc. cit.*, Vol. VIII, 1861, p. 142.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*, Vol. VIII, 1861, p. 303.

⁵ *Loc. cit.*, Ser. IV, Vol. VI, 1870, p. 127.

and Bartsch's notice. The title of the paper is "D'une Méthode de Classification pour les coquilles de la famille des Chemnitzidæ," and on p. 200 is given a tabular statement of the family where appear the names *Oceanida*, *Salassia*, *Ondina*, *Elodia*, *Odetta* and *Noëmia*. No species are mentioned.

In the Ann. Soc. Agri. et Hist. Nat., Lyons, Vol. VII, 1884 (1885), pp. 209 *et seq.*, De Folin included another paper entitled "Constitution Méthodique rationnelle et naturelle de la Famille des Chemnitzidæ." The tabular statement above mentioned is there reproduced without alteration. A reprint of this paper appears to have been consulted by Dall and Bartsch as they quote it under its title and give pagination agreeing with that conclusion.

I have only had access to the first volume of "Les Fonds de la Mer," which appears to be a scarce work.

In that volume on p. 214 two species are diagnosed as *Ondina sulcata* De Folin and *Jaminea bilirata* De Folin. The part including these names was issued in 1869. On p. 264 *Oceanida graduata* De Folin is introduced. This part appeared in 1870. At the end of this volume on p. 314 a list of new species actually to hand is noted. There is mentioned *Odetta spp.*, *Noëmia spp.*, *Lia spp.*, *Elodia elegans* and *Salassia carinata*. These were probably published in the succeeding volumes. I conclude p. 314 came out in 1871.

With their references to these names Dall and Bartsch have been peculiarly unfortunate, in almost every instance errors having crept in.

First (p. 13) they accept as a valid subgenus "*Elodiamea* De Folin 1884 (26)." Referring to (26) p. 18 we read "*Elodiamea* De Folin, Zool. Record, Vol. 22, 1885, p. 94 = *Elodia* De Folin, Les Méléagriniques, 1867, p. 66; type, *Elodia elegans* De Folin, not *Elodia* Desvoidy, 1863; + *Herviera* Melvill and Standen, Journ. Conch., Vol. 9, 1897, p. 185; type, *Pyrgulina gliriella* Melvill and Standen. The Zool. Record for 1885 would not be published until 1886, so that 1884 is obviously incorrect. *Elodia* is not introduced at the place quoted: a species *Eulina elodia* there appears; if that be the same as *Elodia elegans*, then Dall and Bartsch have produced a second complication as they have re-named *elegans* on account of its preoccupation in *Odostomia*.

The Jour. Conch., Vol. 9, p. 185, appeared in 1899 not 1897, and if *Herviera* be a synonym of *Elodiamea*, then the latter is identical with *Odostomella* Bucquoy Dautz. and Dollf. Hedley (P. L. S. N.

S. W., Vol. XXX, p. 525, 1906) has already suggested the identity of *Herviera* with *Olostomella*. Dall and Bartsch wrongly cite this genus as *Olostomiella* and separate it from *Elodiamea* by characters which seem intangible, as the two species of *Herviera* show features assigned to each.

On p. 134 Dall and Bartsch include as valid *Salassia* De Folin, Const. d. Chemnitzidæ, 1885, p. 15, and then for the type species give the quotation *Salassia carinata* De Folin, Fonds de la Mer, Vol. 2, 1872, p. 168, pl. 6, fig. 6.

This latter would appear to be the quotation for the subgenus. Certainly the former cannot be used as the name appeared under exactly the same conditions in the 1870 paper above noted.

However is not the name preoccupied by *Salassa* Moore, P. Z. S., 1859, p. 246? To divert, on p. 16 is indicated and on p. 133 is diagnosed a new subgenus *Salassiella*. Is not this also preoccupied by *Salasiella* Strebél, Mex. K. Land. u. Suswass. Conch., III, p. 6, 29, 1877?

On p. 16 *Oceanida* De Folin is included as valid and the correct reference is given, but the type species name is misquoted *gradata*; it should be *graduata*. Into synonymy Dall and Bartsch consign the rest of De Folin's genera, *Noëmia*, *Lia*, *Odetta*, *Jaminea*, *Jaminina* and *Ondina*. The first three are all recorded as nude names in Vol. I, p. 314, 1871.

This is quoted for *Noëmia*, p. 136, as Fonds de la Mer, 1873, p. 314.

Lia, p. 176, 1870, p. 515.

Odetta, p. 184, 1870, p. 314.

“*Jaminea* De Folin, Constit. Method. de la Fam. Chemnitzidæ, 1885, p. 15. Type *Jaminea bilirata* De Folin; not *Jaminea* Brown, 1827. + *Jaminina* De Folin, Zool. Record, Vol. 22, 1885, p. 94. Type *Jaminea bilirata* De Folin.” This appears in the synonymy of *Menestho* Möller, on p. 184, and seems incorrectly stated. As previously noted *Jaminea bilirata* De Folin was diagnosed in Fonds de la Mer, Vol. I, p. 214, 1869; in the 1885 paper De Folin writes “*Jaminea Brown*,” and gives no names of species so that I cannot understand the reason of typifying it as of De Folin. *Jaminina* De Folin does not occur in any copies of the Zool. Record, 1885, p. 94, that I have had access to, and I have been unable to trace it. Of course all the preceding are minute errors but they are, nevertheless, very perplexing if literature is unavailable.

I have noted the following typographical errors :

P. 8, line 22	Scacchi should read	Brocchi.
11, 22	<i>plicata</i>	<i>plicatula</i> .
17, 22	1853	1833.
18, 20	p. 59	p. 8.
	30	1879
29, 3	<i>plicata</i>	<i>plicatula</i> .
	14	<i>plicatula</i> .
	15	<i>plicatus</i> .

It is interesting to note that these errors are indexed.

On p. 18, line 27 as reference to (41) is given Proc. Royal Soc. Tasmania, 1877, p. 152. The correct quotation is Trans. Roy. Soc., South Australia, Vol. XXIV, p. 98, 1900.

DESCRIPTION OF A NEW LYMNÆA.

BY F. C. BAKER.

LYMNÆA EMARGINATA WISCONSINENSIS nov. var.

Lymnæa ampla Whiteaves (not Mighels), Can. Nat. and Geol., VIII, pp. 102, 112, fig. 11, 1863.—Taylor, Ottawa Nat., VI, p. 35, 1892.

Shell very large, varying from elongate to globose, inflated, usually rather thin; periostracum varying from light yellowish horn to chestnut; nuclear whorls as in *emarginata*; sculpture as in *emarginata*; many specimens have, in addition to the spiral impressed lines, a number of heavy, more or less equidistant, spiral ridges encircling the body whorl; the last whorl may also be somewhat malleated; whorls 5 to 5½; globose, roundly shouldered, inflated, the body whorl very globose and disproportionately swollen; spire varying from broadly acute to flatly depressed, usually about half the length of the entire shell; suture well marked, often deeply impressed; aperture roundly-ovate, rarely quadrate, seldom flaring; peristome with internal, varical thickening; inner lip wide, whitish, broadly reflected over the umbilical region producing a wide, flat expansion, which emarginates the umbilical chink, as in the typical form; umbilical chink usually very large and conspicuous; imperforate individuals are rare; the parietal callus is thick and wide producing a continuous aperture in some specimens; the lower part of the aperture is somewhat effuse in a few individuals.

Length, 23.50; breadth, 15.00; aperture length, 13.00; breadth, 7.50 mill.

Length, 22.00; breadth, 15.00; aperture length, 12.00; breadth, 8.00 mill.

Length, 24.00; breadth, 16.00; aperture length, 13.50; breadth, 9.00 mill.